

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

**Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore, LP Proposal to Install a 4
Inch Surface Pipeline from the NBU 206-9 Well Pad to an
existing surface pipeline near the NBU 431-09E Well Pad
Greater Natural Buttes Unit, Uintah County, Utah
January 2014**

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management



DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

**Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore, LP
Proposal to Install a 4 Inch Surface Pipeline from
the NBU 206-9 Well Pad to an existing surface
pipeline near the NBU 431-09E Well Pad
Greater Natural Buttes Unit, Uintah County, Utah
January 2014**

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

Finding of No Significant Impact	vii
Finding of No Significant Impact:	vii
Signatures:	vii
Decision Record - Memorandum	ix
Selected Action:	ix
Conditions of Approval:	ix
Rationale:	ix
Land Use Plan Conformance:	ix
Public Involvement:	x
Alternatives Considered:	x
Appeal or Protest Opportunities:	x
Signature:	x
1. Introduction and Need for Proposed Action	1
1.1. Introduction:	1
1.1.1. Title, EA number, and type of project:	1
1.1.2. Location of Proposed Action:	1
1.1.3. Name and Location of Preparing Office:	1
1.1.4. Applicant Name:	1
1.2. Purpose and Need for Action:	1
1.3. Conformance with BLM Land Use Plans:	2
1.4. Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or Other Plans:	2
1.4.1. Federal Laws and Statutes:	2
1.4.2. State and Local Laws and Statutes	2
1.5. Identification of Issues:	3
1.5.1. Invasive Plant/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation:	3
1.5.2. Paleontology	3
1.5.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds Including Raptors	3
2. Description of Alternatives	5
2.1. Introduction:	7
2.2. Proposed Action:	7
2.2.1. Pipeline Construction:	7
2.2.2. Noxious Weeds	7
2.2.3. Applicant-Committed Environmental Protection Measures:	8
2.3. No Action Alternative:	8
2.4. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from further Analysis:	8
2.5. Measure Common to All:	8
3. Affected Environment:	9

3.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation	11
3.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds and Vegetation	11
3.1.2. Soils	12
3.2. Paleontology	12
3.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	12
4. Environmental Impacts:	15
4.1. Proposed Action Environmental Impacts	17
4.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation	17
4.1.1.1. Plant Species, Excluding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Designated Species, and Invasive Plants/Noxious Weed Species	17
4.1.1.2. Soils	17
4.1.2. Paleontology	18
4.1.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	18
4.2. No Action Alternative Environmental Impacts	19
4.2.1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	19
4.2.2. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation	19
4.2.3. Paleontology	19
4.2.4. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	19
5. Reasonably Foreseeable Development and Cumulative Impacts:	21
5.1. Cumulative Impacts	23
5.2. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Development	23
5.2.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation	23
5.2.2. Paleontology	24
5.2.3. Wildlife	24
5.2.3.1. Migratory Birds (including raptors)	24
6. Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted:	27
6.1. Agency and Tribal Consultation	29
6.2. Summary of Public Participation	29
6.3. List of Preparers	29
7. References Cited	31
7.1. References	33
8. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist	35

List of Tables

Table 3.1. Plant Species Observed in the Project Area	11
Table 6.1. List of Preparers	29

This page intentionally
left blank


Finding of No Significant Impact

Finding of No Significant Impact:

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA, I have determined that the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement is not required.

Signatures:

Recommended by:




Tyler Cox
Natural Resource Specialist

1/27/2014

[Date]

Approved by:



Authorized Officer
AFM for Minerals

JAN 31 2014

[Date]

This page intentionally
left blank

Decision Record - Memorandum

Selected Action:

It is my decision to approve Kerr McGee Oil & Gas LLP proposal to install 1025 feet of 4 inch surface pipeline in Section 9, T. 10 S., R. 21 E., Uintah County, Utah. The project area is located approximately 33 miles south of Vernal, Utah. The pipeline will be constructed as described in the proposed action alternative of DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA. This decision is subject to the below conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval:

This decision is contingent on meeting all stipulations and monitoring requirements listed below, which were designed to minimize and/or avoid impacts.

- KMG will comply with all COAs in the Vegetation section from Appendix B, Table B-2, of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).
- KMG will comply with all COAs in the Paleontology section from Appendix B, Table B-2, of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).
- A paleontology monitor is required during any ground disturbing activities.
- If, during operations, any paleontological resources as described in BLM H-8270-1 are discovered, all operations which would affect such sites will be suspended and the discovery reported promptly to the surface management agency.

Rationale:

The subject lands were leased for oil or gas development under authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as modified by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. The lessee/operator has the right to explore for oil and gas on the lease as specified in 43 CFR 3103.1-2, and if a discovery is made, to produce oil and/or natural gas for economic gain.

The selected alternative meets the BLM's need to acknowledge and allow development of valid existing leases. The BLM objective to reduce impacts is met by the imposing of mitigation measures to protect other resource values.

Land Use Plan Conformance:

The selected alternative is in conformance with the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (BLM 2008).

The selected alternative is consistent with *Uintah County General Plan* (published in 2007) that encompasses the location of the proposed wells. In general, the plan indicates support for development proposals such as the selected alternative through the plan's emphasis of multiple-use public land management practices, responsible use and optimum utilization.

There are no comprehensive State of Utah plans for the vicinity of the selected alternative. However, the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) have leased much of the nearby state land for oil and gas production. Because the objectives of SITLA are to produce funding for the state school system, and because production on federal leases could further interest in drilling on state leases in the area, it is assumed that the selected alternative is consistent with the objectives of the State.

Public Involvement:

The proposed project was posted on the Eplanning NEPA Register on 12 December 2013. No public interest was received.

Alternatives Considered:

The EA analyzed the proposed action and no action alternatives. The no action alternative was not selected because it would not best meet the BLM's need to acknowledge and allow development of valid existing leases.

Appeal or Protest Opportunities:

This decision is effective upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer. The decision is subject to appeal. Under BLM regulation, this decision is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155, within 20 business days of the date this Decision is received or considered to have been received.

If you wish to file a petition for stay, the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted; and,
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Signature:

Authorizing Official:


Authorized Officer

JAN 31 2014

Date

Chapter 1. Introduction and Need for Proposed Action

This page intentionally
left blank

1.1. Introduction:

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to analyze the potential impacts of the Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP (KMG) surface pipeline project connected to the existing well pad NBU 206-9. KMG proposes to install one 4-inch surface gas pipeline in section 9 T10S R21E SLB Meridian, Uintah County, UT. This EA is a site-specific analysis of the potential impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed action. This analysis is tiered to the Greater Natural Buttes (GNB) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (BLM2012a).

1.1.1. Title, EA number, and type of project:

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP, proposes to instal a 4-inch surface pipeline from the NBU 206-9 well pad to an existing 4-inch gas pipeline.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

1.1.2. Location of Proposed Action:

Project is located approximately 34 miles South of Vernal, UT. It is located in Uintah County, UT. Section 9 T10S R21E.

1.1.3. Name and Location of Preparing Office:

Lead Office - Vernal Field Office

170 South 500 East

Vernal, UT 84078

1.1.4. Applicant Name:

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP

PO Box 173779

Denver, CO 80217

1.2. Purpose and Need for Action:

The BLM's purpose is to respond to the application to install a surface pipeline to facilitate KMG's development of existing federal oil and gas leases in order to meet demands for domestic oil and natural gas while preventing unnecessary or undue degradation to BLM public lands. The proposed pipeline would allow KMG to utilize existing least rights to drill for, extract, remove, and market commercial quantities of oil and natural gas. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA), as amended, and the regulations and policies by which it is implemented, recognize the right of the lease holders to develop federal mineral resources to meet continuing needs and economic demands, so long as unnecessary or undue degradation is not incurred.

The BLM's need is to respond to the applicant's proposal while minimizing environmental impacts and preventing unnecessary or undue degradation of BLM-administered lands. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) mandates that the BLM manage public lands of the basis of multiple use [43 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 1701(a)(7)]. Minerals development and necessary infrastructure are identified as one of the principle uses of public lands in Section 103 of FLPMA [43 U.S.C. § 1702(c)]. FLPMA mandates that the uses be permitted in a manner that assures adequate protection of other resource values.

1.3. Conformance with BLM Land Use Plans:

The Proposed Action would be in conformance with the BLM Utah Vernal Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Record of Decision (ROD) (BLM 2008a) and the terms of the applicable leases for action proposed on BLM-administered lands. The RMP/ROD recognizes valid existing rights (RMP/ROD, page 21). The Minerals and Energy Resources Management Objectives encourage the drilling of oil and gas wells by private industry (RMP/ROD, page 97). The Approved RMP/ROD also allows for processing applications, permits, operating plans, mineral exchanges, and leases on public lands in accordance with policy and guidance and allows for management of public lands to support goals and objectives of other resources programs, respond to public requests for land use authorizations, and acquire administrative and public access where necessary (RMP/ROD, page 86). The BLM has determined that the Proposed Action would not conflict with other decisions in the Vernal Field Office Approved RMP/ROD (BLM 2008a).

1.4. Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or Other Plans:

The Proposed Action and No Action Alternative are consistent with federal, state, and local laws, regulations, and plans (see sections below). Refer to Section 1.5 (Pages 1–6 through 1–10) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on applicable statutes, regulations, required permits, and other policy considerations.

1.4.1. Federal Laws and Statutes:

The subject lands were leased for oil or gas development under authority of the MLA of 1920, as amended, in part, by the FLPMA of 1976, and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. The lessee/operator has the right to explore for oil and gas on the lease as specified in 43 CFR 3103.1–2, and if discovery is made, to produce oil and/or natural gas for economic gain.

1.4.2. State and Local Laws and Statutes

There are no comprehensive State of Utah plans for the vicinity of the Proposed Action. The proposed project is consistent with the Uintah County General Plan, 2011, as amended (County Plan) that encompasses the location of the Proposed Action. In general, the County Plan indicates support for development proposals such as the Proposed Action through the plan's emphasis on multiple-use public land management practices, responsible use, and optimal utilization (Uintah County 2011).

The State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) has leased much of the nearby state land for oil and gas production. Because the objectives of SITLA are to

produce funding for the state school system, and because production on federal leases could lead to further interest in drilling on state leases in the area, it is assumed that the alternatives analyzed, except the No Action Alternative, are consistent with the objectives of the state.

1.5. Identification of Issues:

BLM reviewed KMG's proposed activities to assess the type and magnitude of potential impacts to resources and resource uses on BLM-administrated land. A list of all resources considered is contained in Appendix A, Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Checklist. The "Potentially Impacted (PI) resources, as identified by the BLM, are listed below with issue statements describing the potential impact. These resources are carried forward for description in the Affected Environment section (Chapter 3) and analysis in the Environmental Impacts section (Chapter 4) of this EA. Resources that the BLM identified as "Not Impacted" (NI) by the Proposed Action or "Not Present" (NP) in the Project Area, as identified in the ID Team Checklist, were not carried forward for detailed analysis.

1.5.1. Invasive Plant/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation:

Issue 1: Surface disturbance from installation of surface pipelines would result in the disturbance of soils and vegetation on up to 0.15 BLM-administered land and would increase the potential for invasive plant or noxious weed establishment or expansion.

1.5.2. Paleontology

Issue 1: No scientifically important fossils were found. However, there is a high potential that important fossils will be unearthed during construction.

1.5.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds Including Raptors

Issue 1: Migratory birds found in the area, with up to 0.15 acres of surface disturbance.

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 2. Description of Alternatives

This page intentionally
left blank

2.1. Introduction:

This chapter provides a description of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative. No additional action alternatives have been identified. The No Action Alternative is considered and analyzed to provide a baseline for comparison of the impacts of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action integrates the terms and conditions in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).

2.2. Proposed Action:

KMG proposes to install one 4-inch surface gas pipeline. The pipeline would extend from the NBU 206-9 well pad to an existing 4-inch surface pipeline along the NBU 431-09E well pad. KMG would own and operate this pipeline. The proposed pipeline is all on lease, and a right-of-way would not be required. The entire pipeline is approximately 1,025 feet in length. Approximately 625 feet of the pipeline route follows the roadway. The other approximately 400 feet go cross country between two roads. The pipeline would be built on the roadway and lifted onto the side of the road for the sections of the route that parallel the road. For the cross country sections, the pipeline would be built on a pad, then pulled across country. Pipeline construction should not need the clearing of vegetation. Surface disturbance is not anticipated to be needed, but a 15 foot width cross country path will be analyzed for emergency during construction, if a piece of equipment needs to be driven cross country. That would amount to 0.15 acres of potential disturbance. All of that potential disturbance would be on BLM-administered lands.

2.2.1. Pipeline Construction:

The gas gathering pipelines would be made of steel with fusion bond epoxy coating (or equivalent). The road or well pad would be utilized for pipeline construction and staging. For safe operation, the pipeline would be designed to operate at a maximum allowable operating pressure of 720 to 740 pounds per square inch gauge (PSIG). Normal operating pressures would range between 50 to 150 PSIG. The proposed pipeline would be pneumatically tested before being placed into service. In no case would pressure testing of the pipelines result in discharge of liquids on the ground surface. All above ground facilities/structures would be painted Shadow Gray to match the surrounding landscape. KMG would install pipeline signs along the route to indicate the pipelines' proximity and ownership and to provide emergency contact phone numbers. The pipelines would likely remain in place for a term of 30 years, or so long as needed to collect and transport natural gas and liquids from the Natural Buttes Field.

2.2.2. Noxious Weeds

KMG would control noxious weeds as needed during the life of the gas pipeline. According to the Anadarko Integrated Weed Management Plan, KMG would complete monitoring and management of noxious and invasive weeds of concern annually until reclamation is successful. KMG would map noxious weed infestations on BLM-administered land using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit and submit the data to the BLM with information required in the Vernal BLM Surface Disturbance Weed Policy (BLM 2009). Two patches of saltcedar (*Tamarix Sp.*), a State of Utah List C noxious weed, were identified in the vicinity of the proposed project, including one patch adjacent to the proposed pipeline.

If KMG applies herbicide, it would be done in accordance with an approved Pesticide Use Permit. KMG would record all pesticide applications using a Pesticide Application Record and would submit the data to BLM along with a Pesticide Use Report annually prior to December 31. All weed management on BLM-administered land would be done in accordance with the Vernal BLM Surface Disturbance Weed Policy.

2.2.3. Applicant-Committed Environmental Protection Measures:

KMG adopted the applicable COAs from Appendix B, Table B-2 of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b) as Applicant Committed Environmental Protection Measures (ACEPMs) for this Proposed Action.

2.3. No Action Alternative:

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM Authorized Officer would deny KMG's application for the surface gas pipeline.

2.4. Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from further Analysis:

The BLM did not identify any alternatives besides the Proposed Action that would meet the purpose and need of this project.

2.5. Measure Common to All:

Concerns are occasionally raised as to how BLM would ensure that mitigation measures would be satisfactorily completed in the event that the applicant was issued permission to construct the pipeline and for whatever reason either did not comply with the terms and conditions or was unable to rehabilitate the area upon termination of the pipeline. To respond to these concerns, BLM would require a performance bond prior to allowing any surface disturbing actions. The performance bond would be of sufficient amount to ensure that mitigation and rehabilitation measures were effectively and satisfactorily completed by BLM in the event of default by the holder. The performance bond would be periodically reviewed to ensure sufficiency.

Chapter 3. Affected Environment:

This page intentionally
left blank

The affected environment of the Project Area was evaluated by a BLM Interdisciplinary (ID) team, as documented in the ID Team Checklist (Appendix A). The checklist indicates which resources of concern are present, which resources would be affected by the alternatives and require analysis in the EA, and which resources are either not present in the Project Area or would not be affected to a degree that requires detailed analysis. The description of the affected environment in this section focuses on those resources identified as "PI" (present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA) in the IDTeam Checklist (Appendix A).

The proposed surface pipeline would be located in the Natural Buttes Unit on BLM-administered lands in the BLM Utah Vernal Field Office (Map 1). Mineral extraction activities, livestock grazing, and associated surface disturbance have historically affected the Project Area. This EA is tiered to the GNB Record of Decision (BLM 2012b) and incorporates the GNB Final EIS(BLM 2012a) by reference; as a result, this chapter summarizes and cites the affected environment description from the GNB Final EIS(BLM 2012a) and provides additional site-specific information, where appropriate.

3.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

3.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds and Vegetation

Vegetation in the Project Area vicinity consists predominantly of a mixed desert shrub community. Table 3.1, "Plant Species Observed in the Project Area" (p. 11) identifies common plant species which occur within or near the Project Area. Refer to Section 3.4 for additional information on federal, state, and local listed plant species that occur within the Project Area.

Table 3.1. Plant Species Observed in the Project Area

Scientific Name	Common Name
Shrubs	
<i>Atriplex canescens</i>	Four-winged saltbush
<i>Atriplex confertifolia</i>	Shadscale
<i>Atriplex corrugata</i>	Mat saltbush
<i>Atriplex gardneri</i>	Gardner's saltbush
<i>Artemisia</i> spp.	Sagebrush species
<i>Ceratoides lanata</i>	Winterfat
<i>Chrysothamnus</i> spp.	Rabbitbrush species
<i>Ephedra torreyana</i>	Mormon tea
<i>Sarcobatus vermiculatus</i>	Greasewood
<i>Tetradymia spinosa</i>	Horsebrush
Cacti	
<i>Opuntia</i> sp.	Prickly pear cactus
<i>Pediocactus simpsonii</i>	Mountain Ball Cactus
Grasses and Forbs	
<i>Agropyron dasystachyum</i> var. <i>dasystachyum</i>	Thickspike wheatgrass
<i>Allium textile</i>	Textile onion
<i>Arenaria</i> spp.	Sandwort
<i>Cleome lutea</i>	Yellow beeplant
<i>Cymopterus</i> spp.	Spring parsley
<i>Eriogonum inflatum</i>	Desert trumpet
<i>Descurainia pinnata</i>	Tansy mustard
<i>Hilaria jamesii</i>	Galleta

Scientific Name	Common Name
Phacelia crenulata	Scorpionweed
Phlox spp.	Phlox
Sphaeralcea spp.	Globemallow
Sporobolus airoides	Alkali sacaton
Stipa hymenoides	Indian ricegrass
<i>Invasive Species</i>	
Halogeton glomeratus	Halogeton
Bromus tectorum	Cheatgrass
Salsola kali	Russian Thistle
Source: Grasslands Consulting 2012 and 2013a	

Refer to Section 3.11 (pages 3-78 through 3-87) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on vegetation and invasive/noxious weed species relevant to the Project Area.

3.1.2. Soils

The Project Area is underlain by sedimentary deposits of the Uinta Formation at elevations ranging from approximately 4,900 to 5,180 feet. Soils in the area consist predominantly of stony loam and clay loam. The terrain is rolling hills, and the proposed wells and associated infrastructure would be located primarily on rolling hills (BLM 2012d). The Project Area is located primarily in areas with high constraint soils, as identified in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a), which pose the greatest construction and reclamation constraints compared to other soil types characterized in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a).

3.2. Paleontology

The Project Area is on the Uinta Formation of the Middle Eocene Age, which has a PFYC of 5 (very high). Based on the project location within a PFYC 5 area and presence of high fossil potential areas, fossil locations and occurrences may be encountered during project related construction. Proposed project activities are located within areas identified as high fossil potential areas (SWCA 2013).

3.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)

All migratory birds and their nests are protected from take or disturbance under the Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BEGEPA) of 1940 (16 U.S.C., 668-668d, 54 Stat. 250) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (16 U.S.C., 703 et seq.). These protection laws were implemented for the protection of avian species. Unless permitted by regulations, it is unlawful to pursue, hunt, kill, capture, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any species covered under these Acts. In addition, Executive Order 13186 sets forth the responsibilities of federal agencies to further implement the provisions of these Acts by integrating bird conservation principles and practices into agency activities and by ensuring that federal actions evaluate the effects of actions and agency plans on protected avian species.

No raptor nests were documented within .5 miles of the project area. No surface disturbance will occur with the surface pipeline. The following addresses migratory birds that may utilize the project area for nesting or foraging activities, including those species classified as Priority Species by Utah Partners-in-Flight.

Pinion ~Juniper/Desert Shrub Habitats: bald eagle, black-chinned hummingbird, broad-tailed hummingbird, Brewer's sparrow, burrowing owl, Cassin's finch, Cassin's kingbird, gray flycatcher, gray vireo, grasshopper sparrow, greater sage-grouse, green-tailed towhee, juniper titmouse, mountain bluebird, sage sparrow, sage thrasher, and Virginia's warbler. (Parrish et al. 2002)

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 4. Environmental Impacts:

This page intentionally
left blank

The analysis in this chapter is tiered to the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b), incorporates by reference the analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a), and provides additional site-specific analysis and information, where appropriate, to inform decision-making on this specific development proposal. Environmental impacts are only discussed for resources identified as “PI” (present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA) in the ID Team Checklist (Appendix A).

4.1. Proposed Action Environmental Impacts

This section analyzes the impacts of the Proposed Action on the potentially impacted resources described in the affected environment chapter (Chapter 3).

4.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

4.1.1.1. Plant Species, Excluding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Designated Species, and Invasive Plants/Noxious Weed Species

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 0.15 acres of vegetation habitat, primarily in mixed desert shrub communities. Direct impacts to vegetation would be possible from cross country driving along the pipeline route and degradation of habitat through soil compaction. Indirect impacts to vegetation resources may include the invasion and establishment of introduced, undesired plant species. The severity of these invasions would depend on the success of reclamation and revegetation and the degree and success of noxious weed control efforts. Refer to Section 4.11.3 (page 4-114) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on potential impacts to vegetation.

To minimize potential impacts to vegetation, KMG has committed to the COAs for Vegetation, Vegetation: Weed Management, and Reclamation Plan from the GNB ROD Appendix B, Table B-2 (BLM 2012b), and the Green River District Reclamation Guidelines (BLM 2011).

Mitigation Measures for Vegetation and Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds

This EA is tiered to and incorporates the COAs and mitigation measures included in Appendix B of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). No additional mitigation measures were identified for vegetation during preparation of this EA.

4.1.1.2. Soils

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 0.15 acres of soils, primarily in high constraint soils. High constraint soils pose limitations to successful implementation of reclamation measures and long-term maintenance of protective and productive vegetative cover.

Potential direct impacts to 0.15 acres of soil include mixing of soil horizons, soil compaction, short-term loss of topsoil and site productivity, contamination of soils with petroleum products, loss of soil/topsoil through wind and water erosion, and vegetation loss. Loss of soil/topsoil in disturbed areas would increase competition by annual weed species with native species. Annual weed species are adapted to disturbed conditions, and have less stringent moisture and soil nutrient requirements than do perennial native species. Refer to Section 4.9.3 (pages 4-93 through 4-94) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on potential impacts to soils.

To minimize potential impacts to soils, KMG has committed to the COAs for Soils and Reclamation Plan from the GNB ROD Appendix B, Table B-2 (BLM 2012b); and the Green River District Reclamation Guidelines (BLM 2011).

Mitigation Measures for Soils

This EA is tiered to and incorporates the COAs and mitigation measures included in Appendix B of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). No additional mitigation measures were identified for soils during preparation of this EA.

4.1.2. Paleontology

The Proposed Action would result in approximately 0.15 acres of surface disturbance from installation 1,025 feet of 4-inch surface pipeline. All proposed project activities would occur on the Uinta Formation of the Middle Eocene Age, which has a PFYC of 5 (very high). Based on the project location within a PFYC 5 area and presence of high fossil potential areas, fossil locations and occurrences may be encountered during project related construction. Proposed project activities are located within areas identified as high fossil potential areas (SWCA 2013). Therefore, proposed project activities may result in direct impacts to existing, undiscovered paleontological resources. Direct impacts to paleontological resources are primarily associated with loss of vertebrate fossils from surface-disturbing activities, illegal collecting, and potential vandalism. To prevent any adverse impacts to paleontological resources during this project, a BLM-permitted paleontologist must monitor any ground disturbing activities. Refer to Section 4.5 (4-38 through 4-39) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on potential impacts to paleontological resources.

To minimize potential impacts to paleontological resources, KMG has committed to the COAs for Paleontological Resources from the GNB ROD Appendix B, Table B-2 (BLM 2012b).

Mitigation Measures for Paleontology

- This EA is tiered to and incorporates the COAs and mitigation measures included in Appendix B of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).
- A paleontological monitor is required during any ground disturbing activities.
- If, during operations, any paleontological resources as described in BLM H-8270-1 are discovered, all operations which would affect such sites will be suspended and the discovery reported promptly to the surface management agency.

4.1.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)

As identified in Chapter 3, the project area contains no known raptor nests, but has potential foraging and other potential nesting habitats for other migratory birds. Potential effects of the Proposed Action Alternative on avian species include 1) indirect disturbance from human activity (including harassment, displacement, and noise), and 2) increased direct impacts (including poaching, collisions with vehicles).

Impacts to migratory birds within the proposed project area would also be dependent upon the time when project activities would occur. If these activities occur in the late fall, most of the species would have left the area during winter migration. If construction activities were to occur

during the spring or summer months it could cause birds to move into other adjacent habitats or into habitats where inter-specific and intra-specific competition between species may increase. Noise disturbance associated with project activities would be considered temporary and is anticipated to occur during typical working hours.

Mitigation Measures for Migratory Birds (including raptors)

No additional mitigation measures were identified for migratory birds during preparation of this EA.

4.2. No Action Alternative Environmental Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts from the Proposed Action as the proposed development would be denied. Under the No Action Alternative, currently approved oil and gas development and other activities in the Project Area would continue. Development of 12 existing wells and associated infrastructure in the Project Area has resulted in approximately 53.80 acres of surface disturbance. Refer to ??? for additional information on existing wells and surface disturbance in the Project Area and associated surface disturbance.

4.2.1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Action Alternative, KMG would not develop the proposed gas wells or develop the associated pipelines and infrastructure. The 12 existing wells in the Project Area would continue to produce emissions until they are plugged. Refer to Section 4.1.1 (pages 4-6 through 4-10) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on potential air quality impacts under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.2. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no direct disturbance or indirect effects to soil and vegetation from surface-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action. Refer to Section 4.9.1 (pages 4-89 through 4-91) and Section 4.11.1 (pages 4-100 through 4-104) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on soils and vegetation impacts under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.3. Paleontology

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no direct or indirect disturbance to paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action. Refer to Section 4.5.1 (page 4-138) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on impacts to paleontological resources under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.4. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the surface pipeline. There would be no direct or indirect effects to migratory birds, including raptors. Current land use trends in the area would continue of which would mainly include increased oil and gas development activities. Refer to Section 4.15.1.1 (pages 4-136 through 4-139) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM

2012a) for more information on impacts to migratory birds and raptor species under the No Action Alternative.

Chapter 5. Reasonably Foreseeable Development and Cumulative Impacts:

This page intentionally
left blank

Cumulative impacts are those impacts that result from the incremental impact of each alternative when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, regardless of which agency or person undertakes such other actions. Each section below identifies the Cumulative Impact Analysis Areas (CIAAs) for individual resources and resource issues and the rationale for the selection of each area.

5.1. Cumulative Impacts

Proposed drilling, surface disturbance, and other activities under the Proposed Action (as described in Chapter 2 of this EA) are within the bounds of the cumulative impact analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a). The GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) identified past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development and analyzed cumulative impacts to resources and resource uses from the drilling and development of oil and gas resources in the GNBPA. As a result, the cumulative impact analysis in this chapter tiers to and incorporates by reference the analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a). The analysis in this chapter provides additional site-specific analysis and information, where appropriate, to inform decision-making on this specific development proposal.

5.2. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Development

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the GNBPA primarily includes oil and gas development, but it also includes oil shale; gilsonite; tar sands; sand and gravel; activities associated with recreation, livestock grazing, vegetative treatments, and infrastructure improvements; and other projects. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future oil and gas development in the GNBPA has resulted and will continue to result in approximately 26,093 acres of surface disturbance. Refer to Section 5.2 (pages 5–1 through 5–12) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development.

5.2.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

The CIAA for soils, vegetation, and invasive plants/noxious weeds is the GNBPA. Cumulative impacts are primarily attributable to oil and gas development and vegetation management by various federal agencies. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions would cumulatively and incrementally affect erosion and sedimentation rates within this area, current land uses, revegetation and reclamation success, soil productivity, and the potential introduction and/or spread of noxious weeds and invasive species. Surface-disturbing activity that removes native vegetation and topsoil from the CIAA may cumulatively and incrementally affect general vegetation by fragmenting plant communities and increasing competition with invasive and noxious weeds. Surface-disturbing activities that compact soil, increase erosion and sediment yield, and increase fugitive dust may also cumulatively and incrementally affect general vegetation, as such changes to the landscape may decrease plant productivity and composition in the CIAA.

The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future total area of disturbance due to oil and gas activity in the CIAA is estimated at 26,093 acres (BLM 2012a), which includes the estimated disturbance from the selected alternative in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). The Proposed Action would contribute 0.15 acres to the incremental increase in surface disturbance included in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).

Surface disturbance would reduce soil productivity, disturb vegetation communities, and accelerate erosion for the lifetime of oil and gas production until such time that final reclamation is deemed successful in terms of soil stability and soil productivity as measured by amounts and types of vegetative cover and forage. Each acre of disturbance also destroys native vegetation and vegetative cover and introduces or spreads undesired plant species, which may reduce species biodiversity. Noxious weeds and invasive species already exist throughout the CIAA. In general, soils in the Uinta Basin are very thin, slow to develop, and difficult to reclaim because of the arid climate and lack of organic material. Refer to Section 5.3.9 (pages 5-25 through 5-26) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on cumulative impacts to soils. Refer to Section 5.3.11 (page 5-27) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on cumulative impacts to vegetation, including weeds. The No Action Alternative would not result in an accumulation of impacts.

5.2.2. Paleontology

The CIAA for paleontology resources is the GNBPA. Cumulative impacts on paleontology resources would result from surface-disturbing activities to fossiliferous rock from either development or collection/vandalism activities (BLM 2012a). The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future total area of disturbance due to oil and gas activity in the CIAA is estimated at 26,093 acres (BLM 2012a), which includes the estimated disturbance from the selected alternative in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012a). The Proposed Action would contribute 0.15 acres to the incremental increase in surface disturbance included in the GNB ROD. Destruction of scientifically important fossils would irreversibly and irretrievably damage the paleontological information base, and those destroyed fossils would not be available for future analysis (BLM 2012a). Preconstruction surveys and other required mitigation measures required by the BLM would result in recovery of important fossils and reduce potential accumulation of cumulative impacts. Refer to Section 5.3.5 (page 5-16) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on cumulative impacts to paleontology resources. The No Action Alternative would not result in an accumulation of effects.

5.2.3. Wildlife

5.2.3.1. Migratory Birds (including raptors)

The CIAA for migratory birds and raptors is defined as the project area, which consists of ?? miles of pipeline. There would be no surface disturbance associated with the project activities. Future actions of the Proposed Action could increase human presence in the area continuing to fragment and manipulate the surrounding habitats by increasing the presence of non-native invasive plant species. Further introduction of non-native invasive plant species could have significant adverse impacts on migratory birds that are dependent upon prevalent species for their survival. In general such an environmental shift would probably have negative impacts on migratory birds and raptors and would favor non-native and readily adaptive species.

Impacts to migratory birds would be dependent upon the season of construction activities. Any activities completed in the late fall would less likely have a direct impact to avian species because many of the species would not be nesting in the vicinity and most would have left the area for southern wintering grounds. Construction activities completed during the spring or

summer months could result in temporary displacement from the affected area, which may alter nest establishment or displacement.

Past, present, and future land uses have reduced and will likely continue to reduce the quality and quantity of habitats for wildlife species. Habitat alteration occurring throughout the range of these species would potentially reduce the ability of such species to recover. Cumulative impacts include habitat fragmentation, loss of prey species, increased predation, and loss of breeding habitat. Although many of these impacts continue to occur, many of these impacts as stated under the Proposed Action Alternative have been minimized or completely negated through wildlife mitigations and/or stipulations in accordance with the Vernal Field Office Land Use Plan.

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 6. Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted:

This page intentionally
left blank

6.1. Agency and Tribal Consultation

US Fish and Wildlife Service: No threatened or endangered species are present so no Endangered Species Act consultation is required.

Utah State Historic Preservation Officer: The BLM conducted consultation with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as part of the GNB EIS process. Class III block surveys have been completed for the Project Area and the results of the surveys were sent to the Utah SHPO in March of 2011. Concurrences were included in Appendix E of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). No cultural resources were identified within the APE of this proposed undertaking.

Tribal Consultation: The BLM initiated Government-to-Government consultation with 12 potentially affected and interested Native American Tribes as part of the GNB EIS process on January 9, 2008. As a result of the consultation request, the Navajo Nation requested notification of any unanticipated discoveries unearthed during the course of the project and the Pueblo of Laguna requested notification in the event any new archaeological sites are discovered and artifacts are recovered. No new sites or unanticipated discoveries have been found associated with the Proposed Action. The Hopi Tribe expressed concern with stone cairn sites previously documented in the GNBPA. At the request of the Hopi, the BLM and Director of the Hopi Office of Cultural Preservation visited several of the stone cairn sites in the GNBPA. In August 2009, the BLM prepared a report summarizing the site visit results. No written responses were received from the Hopi. The BLM met with the Hopi in April of 2011 to follow up on the expressed concerns. No further concerns were expressed. For documentation of this process and additional information refer to Appendix E of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).

6.2. Summary of Public Participation

The BLM posted notification of this EA on the Eplanning NEPA Register on 12 December 2013. No public interest has been expressed.

6.3. List of Preparers

Table 6.1. List of Preparers

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document
BLM Preparers		
Tyler Cox	Natural Resource Specialist	Project manager Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
Daniel Emmett	Wildlife Biologist	Review and revision of Migratory birds (including raptors).
Elizabeth Gamber	Paleontology Specialist	Review and revision of the Paleontology resource section.

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 7. References Cited

This page intentionally
left blank

7.1. References

- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2012a. Greater Natural Buttes Final Environmental Impact Statement, Vol. I, Chapters 1-9. BLM-UT-080-07-807. Vernal Field Office, Vernal Utah. March 2012.
- _____. 2012b. Greater Natural Buttes Record of Decision. BLM-UT-080-07-807. Vernal Field Office, Vernal Utah. March 2012.
- _____. 2011. Green River District Reclamation Guidelines for Reclamation Plans. Instruction Memorandum No. IM UTG000-2011-003 Green River District Reclamation Guidelines, March 2011. BLM Green River District.
- _____. 2010. Memorandum of Understanding between BLM and US Fish and Wildlife Service to Promote the Conservation of Migratory Birds. BLM MOU WO-230-2010-04. 14p.
- _____. 2009. Vernal Field Office Surface Disturbing Weed Policy. Instruction Memorandum No. UTG010-2010-001. Green River District, Vernal, Utah.
- _____. 2008a. Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan. BLM-UT-PL-09-003-1610. Vernal Field Office, Vernal, Utah. October 2008.
- _____. 2008b. Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Vernal Field Office, Vernal, Utah. August 2008.
- _____. 1997. Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM in Utah (BLM-UT-GI-97-001-4000). BLM, Utah State Office.
- Parrish, J.R., F.P. Howe, R.E. Norvell. 2002. Utah Partners in Flight Avian Conservation Strategy Version 2.0. Utah Partners in Flight Program, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, UDWR Publication Number 02-27. i-xiv + 302 pp.
- SWCA Environmental Consultants. 2013. Paleontological Assessment for the NBU 206-9 Pipeline. Uintah County, Utah.
- Uintah County. 2011. Uintah County General Plan. Available online: <http://co.uintah.ut.us/>.
- USDI and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2007. Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development. BLM/WO/ST-06/021+3071/REV 07. Bureau of Land Management. Denver, Colorado. 84 pp.

This page intentionally
left blank

Project Title: Kerr McGee proposes to install 1025 feet of 4 inch surface pipeline.

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

File/Serial Number: UTU63047A

Project Leader: Tyler Cox

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NI	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Emissions from earth-moving equipment and vehicle traffic, would not likely adversely affect air quality.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	BLM Natural Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	No cultural resources were identified within the APE of the proposed undertaking.	Cameron Cox	12/18/2013
NP	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	No Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are identified within the APE. The proposed project will not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	Cameron Cox	12/18/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013



Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NP	Environmental Justice	No minority or economically disadvantaged communities or populations would be disproportionately adversely affected by the Proposed Action or alternatives.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	Farmlands (prime/unique)	Prime or unique farmlands are not present in the Project Area, as designated by the NRCS.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	Fuels/Fire Management	No fire or fuel management activities are planned for the Project Area. The proposed project would not conflict with fire management activities due to the use of existing and proposed well pad operations.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Geology/Minerals/ Energy Production	Known gilsonite veins trend through this area. If gilsonite is encountered during construction, please report that information to BLM VFO. The depth and thickness of the vein is important information that should be provided to BLM. If any blasting is needed during construction activities, the operator must notify any active gilsonite operation within 2 miles of the location 48 hours prior to any blasting. No other minerals will be effected by this project.	Betty Gamber	11/27/2013
PI	Invasive Plants/ Noxious Weeds, Soils & Vegetation	The proposed project will result in 0.15 acres of disturbance of soils and vegetation. Surface disturbance will provide suitable habitat for the establishment and spread of non-native plant species.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Lands/Access	The Project Area is located within the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan planning area which allows for oil and gas development with associated road and pipeline right-of-ways. No existing land uses would be changed or modified by the implementation of the Proposed Action; therefore there would be no adverse effects.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None Present as per 2008 Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review. Part of the White River West inventory unit. No wilderness character found.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013

Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	Livestock Grazing: The proposed project is located within the Sandwash cattle grazing allotment. The allotment is seasonally permitted from November 30 to April 30 with up to 4,523 AUMs. This area has many existing well pad sites and pipelines. The proposed pipe line will have very little effect on the livestock grazing. This area is heavily bisected by numerous roads and other oil and gas projects. Very little disturbance would occur other than increasing the traffic on the already existing roads. The proposal is consistent with multiple use of public lands and activities in the area. It is not anticipated that this proposal would negatively impact grazing operations. There are no known range improvements in this part of the allotment that would be impacted by this proposal. This proposal is not expected to affect Rangeland Health Standards in this allotment.	Craig L Newman	01/02/2014
PI	Paleontology	No scientifically important fossils were found. However, there is a high potential that important fossils will be unearthed during construction. Paleo monitoring is required for any ground disturbing activities.	Betty Gamber	11/27/2013
NP	Plants: BLM Sensitive	The proposed action was surveyed for Sterile yucca (<i>Yucca sterilis</i>) on 8/27/2013; no plants were found. No outcrops of Green River Shale formations are present in the vicinity of the proposed action and the nearest known mapped sensitive plant areas occur approximately 15 miles west upon VFO GIS review.	Maggie Marston	1/14/2014
NI	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	The proposed action falls outside of the VFO 2013 <i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i> and <i>S. brevispinus</i> USFWS/BLM-designated habitat polygons by a distance of greater than 3 miles. The nearest known individuals of <i>S. wetlandicus</i> occur approximately 3.6 miles northwest. Field Survey was conducted on 8/27/2013 for <i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i> within a 300' buffer; no individuals were located. Although the project will occur in desert pavement areas of mixed quality for threatened <i>Sclerocactus ssp.</i> the surface pipeline, as mitigated and surveyed in the proposed action, falls outside the parameters required for USFWS consultation and/or further mitigation. Surface disturbance is	Maggie Marston	1/14/2014


Determina- tion	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		expected to be minimal and minimized by lack of need for blading, therefore <i>Sclerocactus</i> ssp. pollinator and or potential habitats should remain unaffected.		
NI	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	No riparian sites are inventoried at or in the vicinity of the project area. Based on personal knowledge of the area and confirmed by Field Office data from GIS information.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Recreation	This proposed project is within the Extensive Recreation Management Area and though the project is located in a section adjacent to the White River, none of the proposed project is within the viewshed of boaters within the river corridor.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NI	Socio-Economics	No impact to the social or economic status of the county or nearby communities would occur from this project due to its small size in relation to ongoing development throughout the basin.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Visual Resources	The Project Area is located in VRM Class IV and the proposed development would be consistent with the management objectives in VRM Class IV. Baseline VRI identified the area with a class C rating correlating to a Class IV inventory, thus matching the current management class for the area	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NI	Wastes (hazardous/solid)	No chemicals subject to reporting under SARA Title III in amounts greater than 10,000 pounds would be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of annually in association with the project. Trash and other waste materials would be cleaned up and removed immediately after completion of operations.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	Water: Floodplains	No flood plains were mapped in the project area by HUD. The onsite confirmed this information.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Water: Groundwater Quality	Groundwater is likely present at over 500' below ground surface and would not be impacted by this project.	Betty Gamber	11/27/2013

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	The proposed construction of the pipelines would alter the topography of the area to a small degree and change surface water flow patterns. It is not expected that surface water or stormwater would be created to the level of concern for Clean Water Act Section 402 (stormwater) review. In addition federal law has exempted energy development from stormwater requirements.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Water: Surface Water Quality	Surface waters: The only potential for the proposed project to negatively impact water quality would be increased potential for increased disturbance to surface soils which could cause soil erosion. This would not be expected to occur in a way that would be negative to surface waters. The site is in an upland area and more than a mile from perennial waters.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Water: Waters of the U.S.	None are present in the project area per USGS topographic map and GIS data review.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Wild Horses	The Project Area occurs within the Bonanza Herd Area/Herd Management Area as described in the VFO 2008 RMP. However, the Bonanza Herd Area is not actively managed for wild horses and any horses present on Federal lands are in trespass. As a result, the Proposed Action would not affect the management objectives of the Bonanza Herd Area.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
PI	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds are present. No known raptor nests exist within project area.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	The project is not within designated big game habitat.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	Is the proposed project in sage grouse PPH or PGH? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the answer is yes, the project must conform with WO IM 2012-043.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Woodlands/Forestry	None Present as per Vernal Field Office RMP/ROD and GIS database.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator		1/29/14	
Authorized Officer		1-31-2014	

K:\ANADARKO\2012\2012_10_NBU_AS-BUILTS_MISC\GIS\NBU 206-9 PL SUNDRY\NBU 206-9 PIPELINE SUNDRY_D.mxd 8/20/2013 4:49:44 PM



Legend

- Well - Proposed
- Well - Existing
- Well Pad - Existing
- Gas Pipeline - Proposed
- Gas Pipeline - To Be Upgraded
- Gas Pipeline - Existing
- Liquid Pipeline - Proposed
- Liquid Pipeline - Existing
- Road - Proposed
- Road - Existing
- Bureau of Land Management
- Indian Reservation
- State
- Private

WELL PAD - NBU 206-9

TOPO D
PROPOSED GAS PIPELINE SUNDRY
LOCATED IN SECTION 9, T10S, R21E,
S.L.B.&M., UINTAH COUNTY, UTAH

**Kerr-McGee Oil &
Gas Onshore L.P.**

1099 18th Street
Denver, Colorado 80202



CONSULTING, LLC
2155 North Main Street
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801
Phone 307-674-0609
Fax 307-674-0182

SCALE: 1" = 2,000ft

DRAWN: TL

REVISED:

NAD83 USP Central
DATE: 8 Aug 2013

DATE:

SHEET NO:

1

1 OF 1